EXHIBIT 27

			Page 1
1		UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO	OURT
2	EASTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE		
3			
4	ULTIMA SERVIC	ES CORPORATION,	
5	Pla	intiff,	
6	v.		Case No.
7	U.S. DEPARTME	NT OF AGRICULTURE,	2:20-cv-0041-
8	U.S. SMALL BU	SINESS ADMINISTRATION,	DCLD-CRW
9	SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, and		
10	ADMINISTRATOR OF THE SMALL BUSINESS		
11	ADMINISTRATION,		
12	Def	endants.	
13			
14		VIDEOCONFERENCE DEPOSITION	ON OF
15		AMY STONEBRAKER	
16	DATE:	Wednesday, May 25, 202	2
17	TIME:	9:32 a.m.	
18	LOCATION:	Remote Proceeding - DC	
19		Washington, DC 20005	
20	REPORTED BY:	Timothy Guevara, Notary	y Public
21	JOB NO.:	5242863	
22			

1	APPEARANCES
2	ON BEHALF OF PLAINTIFF ULTIMA SERVICES CORPORATION:
3	MICHAEL E. ROSMAN, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
4	MICHELLE SCOTT, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
5	Center for Individual Rights
6	1100 Connecticut Avenue Northwest, Suite 625
7	Washington, DC 20036
8	rosman@cir-usa.org
9	scott@cir-usa.org
10	(202) 833-8402
11	
12	ON BEHALF OF DEFENDANTS U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
13	AGRICULTURE, U.S. SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
14	SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE, AND ADMINISTRATOR OF THE
15	SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION:
16	JULIET GRAY, ESQUIRE (by videoconference)
17	Department of Justice Civil Rights Division
18	Employment Litigation Section
19	150 M Street Northeast
20	Washington, DC 20530
21	juliet.gray@usdoj.gov
22	(202) 514-3831

	Pag	e 3
1	INDEX	
2	EXAMINATION:	PAGE
3	By Mr. Rosman	6
4	By Ms. Gray	99
5		
6	EXHIBITS	
7	NO. DESCRIPTION	PAGE
8	Exhibit 1 MS1 Status Emails	34
9	Exhibit 2 MS2 Status Emails	39
10	Exhibit 3 MS3 NRCS Request Letter, 9/6/18	43
11	Exhibit 4 MS4 Denison Adverse Impact Letter	
12	To USDA, 9/20/18	45
13	Exhibit 5 Decision Memo	56
14	Exhibit 6 VA1 PCI Offer Letter	76
15	Exhibit 7 VA2 PCI Contract (2021)	80
16	Exhibit 8 VA3 2019 Offer Letter	85
17	Exhibit 9 VA4 2019 Acceptance Letter	86
18	Exhibit 10 GA1 Rividium Contract	94
19	(Exhibits attached.)	
20		
21		
22		

Q Okay. And do you recall what the subject matter of that meeting was?

2.1

A If I remember, she was making visits to her staff that were working in the office as a check-in. I think she did that -- made visits to several state offices, maybe during that course of that year. And we, I think at that point, a lot of the IDIQs were, at least my IDIQ, I think, was almost to its ceiling amount. And I think we discussed what would happen for re-competition at that time.

Q Do you recall what you said and what she said?

A I think she asked me -- if I recall, she asked me what would be done, and I told her they would -- once we received packages or requests to procure new services from the states, then it would be up to the contracting officer to determine method for procurement.

Q Did she ever express concern to you during the course of this meeting that contracts were being reserved for the 8(a) Business Development Program?

A I think she asked me if they would be posted

to FedBizOpps, I think was what it was called at the time, and now it's SAM.gov. And I told her that it would depend on the contracting officer when -- the timing of new requirements were received, and that they would look at the path forward, either posting it to FedBizOpps at that time, using GSA schedule, or looking at 8(a) set-asides for forward procurement.

MR. ROSMAN: Okay. So could I ask you to put the first two Mississippi documents in Exhibit Share?

A Sure.

2.1

- Q Do you have access to Exhibit Share, Ms. Stonebraker?
 - A I do. Yes. I have it open.
 - Q At the time of your meeting with Ms.

 Bennett, had a decision been made to reserve a contract to provide administrative services to the Mississippi NRCS office, to the 8(a) program?
 - A Possibly. That could have been the path that the contracting officer had chosen at that time for that requirement. Based on timeframe of when it was needed, that may have been the past selected.

- Q Okay. And this specific email was referring to a contract for Mississippi?
 - A Yes. It appears that is the case.
 - Q I'm sorry. I couldn't hear your answer.
- A Yes. It appears that this one is specifically related to Mississippi.

2.1

- Q And do you remember the process by which a contract to provide administrative services to the Mississippi NRCS office was set aside for the 8(a) program at this time?
- A Well, I believe in the other exhibit,

 Exhibit 2, we said we were setting aside -- hang on,

 let me get back to Exhibit 1. The contracting

 officer, Danny, in Exhibit 1, in Celeste's email to me

 said that contracting decided to set it aside for sole

 source, and it appears it was based on timing of when

 the new award needed to be in place.
 - Q And what do you mean by timing?
- A Well, it was August of 2018 and the award needed to be in place by 9/30 of 2018. So that was 40 days, which would not have been enough time to post the solicitation, receive offers, evaluate offers, and

- 1 | make an award in 40 days.
- 2 Q Okay.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A If I recall, the Mississippi award was over \$250,000, which is our simplified acquisition threshold, and that requires that it be posted for 30 days.
 - Q Danny here is Mr. Mandell, Danny Mandell?
 - A Yes. Danny Mandell.
 - Q Okay. And did you have discussions with Mr. Mandell about the process of setting aside this particular requirement for the 8(a) program?
 - A We may have had that discussion as part of his decision process because of the timing of -- of the requirement.
 - Q Did he ever tell you that the SBA was conducting an adverse impact analysis for purposes of this particular contract?
 - A I recall that there was an issue with the 8(a) firm that we initially -- or he initially was going to seek approval to use. I don't recall that it was due to any adverse impact.
- Q Okay.

Page 60

A I don't recall the exact time that we would've pulled the data down.

- Q But it was shortly before you think the memo was written. Right?
 - A Yes.

Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- Q Okay. And does this refresh your recollection as to whether or not you had exercised any options for Region 1?
- should have been exercised at that point. As I said, the Arkansas one was awarded in September of 2017. This memo is dated March 2018. So at least one of the option periods would've been exercised in order to even issue the task order for Arkansas, because it exceeded the initial \$2 million ceiling.

I believe at least one of the options

- Q You may not have heard my question correctly.
- 18 A Okay.
- 19 Q I was asking about Region 1 and my question 20 was --
- 21 A Oh, I'm sorry.
- 22 Q My question was, does it refresh your

recollection as to whether any options had been exercised in Region 1?

- A It does not appear that we would've exercised an option for Region 1 based on the obligations that were made at that time, which is under the \$2 million.
- Q Thank you. Okay. Did you have any discussions with anyone in leadership about moving allocated money from one region to another?
- A No. I would not have had a discussion like that.
- Q Okay. Do you have a discussion with anyone about that topic?
 - A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- Q Okay. During the course of the operation of the IDIQs, did you have any communications with permanent staff at any NRC offices regarding Ultima Services Corporation?
 - A I'm sure that I did.
- Q Did you have any communications about the work they were doing, whether it was satisfactory?
- 22 A Usually, you don't hear a lot unless there's

awarding something for administrative support, whether it would've been 8(a) or some other vehicle or path.

- Q Okay. Well, how about the period from the beginning of the IDIQ contracts to the time that you left for the Department of Energy? Did you ever use the 8(a) program to fulfill a requirement of an NRCS office for administrative support?
- A I don't recall having CO'd any admin support requirements, new ones, prior to leaving and after the decision memo, period.
- Q Okay. Did anyone in leadership ever suggest that you should use the 8(a) program to meet or fulfill requirements for administrative support for NRCS offices?
 - A No.
- Q Okay. Was there any plan that was communicated to you to increase NRCS's use of the 8(a) program?
- 19 A No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

- 20 Q Or FPACs?
- A No. We have small business goals that are provided to us each year by the department, and by

Page 72

1 department I mean, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

- There is not a specific category or a goal for 8(a).
 - O Okay. How about SDBs?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

- A We do have a goal for SDB, but to my knowledge, there's not a specific set-aside for SDB. 8(a)falls within the SDB set-aside, but I don't believe there's a specific SDB set aside.
 - Q I may not have understood your answer. You said the 8(a) falls within the SDB --
 - A Well, 8(a) -- the 8(a) small business is considered a disadvantaged small business, but they are -- I don't believe -- the 8(a) has a set-aside. I don't be believe there's a actual SDB set-aside that's called out in the FAR. There's one -- like, there's specific set-asides that they specifically address in the FAR, which is like 8(a), woman-owned small business, HUBZone small business, veteran-owned small business. There isn't one section specifically targeting the disadvantaged small business.
- Q Right. But there are goals for SDBs. Right?
- 22 A Correct. Yes. Those are set at -- at the

Page 73 1 USDA level. And a contract that is set aside for the 2 0 8(a) program would count towards the SDB goal. Right? 3 It would -- it would, yes. Α 4 Because all 8(a) participants are also SDBs. 5 Q 6 Right? 7 Α Correct. 8 Q Okay. Okay. 9 Α But a woman-owned small business may also 10 qualify as an SDB and would also count towards SDB 11 qoals. 12 It might but it wouldn't necessarily. 0 13 Right? 14 It may not. I don't know. I'm not that Α 15 familiar with how the SDB is made up, but it's possible that a company can be multiple -- fall in 16 multiple set-aside categories for their business. 17 18 Q Right. No, I understand that. I was just trying to understand that all 8(a) participants are 19 also going to --20 2.1 Α Yes. That is correct. All 8(a) are considered to be SDB. Yes. 22

Q Okay. So just briefly describe for me your understanding what a contracting officer's discretion is in awarding contracts under the 8(a) program.

2.1

A Well the contracting officer, based on market research, based on a requirement, based on complexity dollar threshold, they would make a determination on whether or not something would be set aside, and if you would further set aside for specific socioeconomic category, which would be 8(a) or woman-owned or HUBZone.

Q Okay. And since your return to the USDA, have contracting officers continued to use the 8(a) program?

A Once the requirement is in the 8(a) program, it remains in the 8(a) program until the SBA releases it from the program.

Q Okay. To your knowledge, have contracting officers used the 8(a) program for requirements that were not previously in the 8(a) program?

A I would imagine they have, but I can't answer that question. I don't know what the others have done.

Page 78 letter, no. 1 Okay. Well, we'll look at something else in 2 a few minutes. Let me just ask you a few more 3 questions. You reviewed this document before you signed it? 5 Yes. 6 Α 7 Okay. And you made sure that it was all 8 accurate? 9 Α Yes. 10 Okay. So take a look briefly at the Q paragraph that is numbered 8. 11 12 Okay -- okay. Okay. So this is referencing another 8(a) 13 contract order. Correct? 14 Α That's correct. 15 Okay. And this is an allusion to what you 16 were referring to previously, that the contract or the 17 18 requirement needs to be fulfilled if it was within the 8(a) program, unless the SBA releases that 19 requirement? 20 2.1 Α That's correct. Okay. I think you said previously that it 22 0

was a new requirement. Could you just take a look at paragraph 10?

2.1

A When I said new, I meant new as in a new year. We were doing a new requirement, but yes, it's a follow-on to a previous award. But in terms of it coming to us, it came to us as a new action. We weren't -- it wasn't an option period to be exercised. It was a new, fresh requirement. It just happens to be a follow-on to something that was already in place, and the customer now says they want or still need support, in terms of general clerk's support.

Q Okay. I'm not sure I understood then what you meant by new requirement. Could you explain that, please?

A Well, it was new in the year that it was provided to us. So it was new, as in we're starting over new to make an award for admin support for Virginia. But it is, in essence, a follow-on contract to same or similar services that was performed under the contract that is referenced in Number 8 that's expiring, which makes it then still fall within the 8(a).

Page 115

CERTIFICATE OF DEPOSITION OFFICE:	CERTIFICA:	FE OF I	DEPOSIT	rion o	FFICE	ΞR
-----------------------------------	------------	---------	---------	--------	-------	----

I, TIMOTHY GUEVARA, the officer before whom
the foregoing proceedings were taken, do hereby
certify that any witness(es) in the foregoing
proceedings, prior to testifying, were duly sworn;
that the proceedings were recorded by me and
thereafter reduced to typewriting by a qualified
transcriptionist; that said digital audio recording of
said proceedings are a true and accurate record to the
best of my knowledge, skills, and ability; that I am
neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any
of the parties to the action in which this was taken;
and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of
any counsel or attorney employed by the parties
hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the
outcome of this action.

TIMOTHY GUEVARA

Notary Public in and for the District of Columbia

[X] Review of the transcript was requested.

5242863-2

```
Juliet Gray, Esquire
      Juliet.gray@usdoj.gov
 3
                             May 28, 2022
      Ultima Services Corporation v. US Department Of Agriculture Et
 4
          5/25/2022, Amy Stonebraker (#5242863)
          The above-referenced transcript is available for
 6
 7
      review.
          Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should
 8
 9
      read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are
10
      any changes, the witness should note those with the
      reason, on the attached Errata Sheet.
11
          The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of
12
13
      Deponent and Errata and return to the deposing attorney.
      Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at
14
      erratas-cs@veritext.com.
15
16
17
       Return completed errata within 30 days from
18
     receipt of testimony.
        If the witness fails to do so within the time
19
20
     allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed.
21
22
                     Yours,
23
                    Veritext Legal Solutions
24
25
```

1	Ultima Services Corporation v. US Department Of Agriculture Et
2	Amy Stonebraker (#5242863)
3	ERRATA SHEET
4	PAGE 11 LINE 7 CHANGE
5	From: 9 or and 11
6	REASON_ typo
7	PAGE 30 LINE 7 CHANGE
8	From: beyond 9/30 of 2018 To: 9/30 of 2019
9	REASON_misstated ending year in discussion on 2 yr funds
10	PAGE 33 LINE 22 CHANGE
11	From: past selected To: path selected
12	REASON_ misheard word used
13	PAGE 35 LINE 8 CHANGE
14	To: Let me read that From: Let read that
15	REASON_word left out of statement
16	PAGE 61 LINE 17 CHANGE
17	From: NRC To: NRCS
18	REASON Wrong typed acronym
19	PAGE 84 LINE 21 CHANGE
20	From: 5611100 To: 561110
21	REASON NAICS code incorrectly typed
22	Page 86 Line 11 CHANGE- From: Temporary health services
23	To: Temporary help services REASON Incorrect word typed in statement
24	Page 108 Line 13 CHANGE From: once the test orders
25	To: once the task orders Reason Incorrect word typed
	Amy Stonebraker STONEBRAKER Date: 2022.06.14 08:06:05-04'00' Date: 06/14/2022

5242863-2

1	Ultima Services Corporation v. US Department Of Agriculture Et
2	Amy Stonebraker (#5242863)
3	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT
4	I, Amy Stonebraker, do hereby declare that I
5	have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any
6	corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as
7	noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is
8	a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony
9	given by me.
10	AMY Digitally signed by AMY
11	STONEBRAKER Date: 2022.06.14 08:06:21 -04'00' 06/14/2022
12	Amy Stonebraker Date
13	*If notary is required
14	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS
15	, DAY OF, 20
16	
17	
18	
19	NOTARY PUBLIC
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	